



University
of Glasgow

Philo, C. (2001) *Madness in a 'secret region': extended notes on Denise Jodelet's 'Madness and Social Representations'*. Discussion Paper.

Copyright © 2001 The Author.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

The content must not be changed in any way or reproduced in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder(s)

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/96748/>

Deposited on: 9 September 2014

Madness in a 'secret region': extended notes on Denise Jodelet's *Madness and Social Representations*

by Chris Philo,
April, 2001.

Madness in the countryside: basics of Jodelet's study

If they are in a hurry [the motorist] will hardly notice any difference between the village they are now crossing, following the S-bend of the road, and the many others they have already passed through on the trunk road, with their lines of shops and houses, their pulled blinds and closed doors. Turning the bend, they will scarcely glimpse the dense obscurity of the village centre which here coils its white stone houses and its moss-covered tiles tightly around the church, and there unfolds them in a criss-cross of new alleyways. It is unlikely that they will notice the grace of the village; their attention has not been awakened: guidebooks and specialist works make little mention of this ancient stronghold, one of the famous Bourbon Châtellenies of the 16th-century. (p.25)

This is the countryside backwater that forms the spatial context for Denise Jodelet's remarkable study of madness, its 'social representations', and its place within the everyday contemporary social life of an advanced Western nation (France). Let us stay, at least for the moment, with how Jodelet introduces this particular spatial context, which in many respects seems to very much a stereotypical European rural idyll. We are on route with motorists through a rustic district lying at the northern extremity of the Bourbonnais, now a *département*, "isolated from the rest of the region ... by the curtain of forest which extends over some 10.435 hectares" (p.26). We are passing through many small villages, enjoying the "splendid natural site" which is the oak forest, "with its vast, deep lakes" (pp.26-27); and we are happening across the small town, barely more than a village, of Ainay-le-Château, which offers a splodge of 'urban development' set against "the softness of the wooded countryside ... , with its fields bounded by living hedges, punctuated by heavily leaved trees and traditional rural habitations, disturbed only by the slow movement of the Charolais cattle" (p.26). So, why is it that this district and this rural town comprise such a blank spot in the guides and books? Why is that a special 1959 edition of the magazine *Richesses de France* devoted to the overall region says nothing about this small town, despite the fact that it is only a few kilometres away from several other places all recorded as good places to stop on 'the detour to Hérisson'?

A clue is given by the presence in Ainay-le-Château of a slightly odd-looking building, "a large modern construction, not that it is a complete blemish on the village with its brick cladding reminiscent of the ochre of the roofs" (p.27). This is the organisational and treatment centre of something called the 'Family Colony', "a psychiatric establishment of a rather special kind: here people are cared for and administered but they are not shut in" (p.28). Indeed, the people who are 'on the books' of this establishment, the people with mental health problems, the mad, the *bredins* or 'loonies' as they are known in the local dialect, are not shut into this building; but rather they live with families in their homes, their house, farmsteads and cottages, in the town and also spread around the villages of the immediate district. Jodelet proposes that

here we arrive at "the solution to the mystery enshrouding this paradoxical and secret region" (p.28), a solution and a secret which never failed to impress upon her in the course of her sustained inquiries into the circumstances of the mad residents of this rural town and its environs. She refers to "[t]he hidden secret of a region open to the mentally ill", and also to "a region which ... resembles one of those 'wilderness areas' at the fringes of normality and social control, in which Mary Douglas (1973) sees the emergence of new cults/religions" (p.28). At the outset, then, the impression is of an out-of-the-way locality, one slightly wild and liminal, where are to be found those non-conforming, even noxious land-uses and goings-on that are unwelcome in the midst of more 'mainstream' centres of human population and endeavour. As such, Jodelet hints at the rural as a repository of unwanted human difference, albeit also drawing a consistent contrast with the apparently idyllic rural character, particularly in an aesthetic sense, of the locality (an idyllic character which might otherwise attract many visitors and be talked up more forcefully in the guidebooks).

Jodelet explains the basic functioning and rationale of the 'Family Colony' as follows:

A Family Colony is a psychiatric hospital based on the idea of 'foster family' placement. The patients who depend on it administratively and medically benefit from a free, family-based way of life. Their accommodation, food and day-t-day supervision are provided by families living in the vicinity of the hospital building although, properly speaking, these families do not form part of the hospital's nursing staff. Thus in the 1970s, in the case which has inspired our study, some thousand patients entrusted to approximately 500 families were dispersed within a radius of 20km from the medical and administrative headquarters located in the town of Ainay-le-Château. (pp.28-29)

The Ainay-le-Château Family Colony is for men, and, along with the women's Family Colony in Dun-sur-Auron, is "the only experiment in family help for adults [with mental illnesses] carried out in France" (p.29). It has a long history, being 'opened' in 1900, and it has acquired a 'revolutionary' gloss in the tradition of providing a genuinely 'open door' and 'non-restraint' regime for its patients. Moreover, "[f]rom a therapeutic point of view, the Colony was intended, in the eyes of its initiators, to realise an innovatory form of 'moral treatment' in which the aid of family placement was expected to augment the benefits of isolation in the fresh air of the country and the tranquillity of rural life, far removed from the noise and bustle of the city" (p.30). [As such, it fitted well into that whole ruralising dynamic, obeying 'moral' locational criteria, which shaped much of the nineteenth-century asylum system throughout Europe: see Philo's historical-geographical work on asylums.] There were important models to follow, notably the long-standing example of Gheel in Belgium (see p.34), and it was agreed in the late-19th century that a French 'national' Family Colony should be established. "Poorer municipalities" were interested in the proposal, and "Dun-sur-Auron was chosen because of its remoteness from railways and the main arteries of communication" (pp.34-35), illustrating that the project was genuinely supposed to be sited well off 'the beaten track'. The women's colony at Dun-sur-Auron soon grew, some members diffusing to nearby Ainay-le-Château, where efforts began to find family placements for men, and leading to the opening of the colony in this small rural town in 1900, initially as a mixed colony but soon becoming devoted to a male population (see p.35). Both colonies evidently entailed an experiment with a form of 'care in the community' long *before* this became the supposed ideal of mental health policy throughout Europe from the 1950s and 1960s onwards, and they embodied an apparently inclusionary solution to the 'problem' of madness that contrasted

with the more common exclusionary approach taken by the asylums (renamed as mental hospitals circa the 1920s and 1930s).

The Family Colony of Ainay-le-Château has remained open and running ever since, albeit undergoing changes which Jodelet documents, but what has to be acknowledged - a fact which underlies much of her study, and which also may prompt some suspicion about its community care credentials - is that the majority of the family placements of insane people have an *economic* motivation. The reason for this is that the 'lodgers', as they are termed, are a source of income, in that the state effectively pays for their board-and-lodging, as well as normally being required to do all manner of jobs, large and small, which generate direct or indirect financial gains for their host families. Arguments about the benefits to both household economies and the local economy have raged for years in the district, and Jodelet notes that "[t]he sometimes obsessively meticulous enumeration of profits is the foster parents' major topic of conversation" (p.39). (And she wonders if this insistence on explaining the profitability of the system is a manifestation of the people concerned trying to 'excuse', particularly to outsiders, what might seem as the strange 'closeness' entailed by having a mentally unwell lodger in your own home.) The comment that "it's the industry of the region" (eg. quoted on p.27, p.39) is repeatedly met with, so Jodelet reports, and some locals nowadays argue that the whole economic basis of the locality has become inextricably tied up with the presence of the insane lodgers: "It used to be a region of charcoal burners and now it's been converted to a region of placements" (quoted on p.40). It is declared that the lodgers are themselves a significant 'consumer group' locally, given that they do have savings from their work (some receive a wage) as well as from funds sent by 'natural' families, and it is evident that they do buy goods of various kinds as well as produce, meals and drinks. Similarly, the extra income obtained by the placement families feeds into greater consumption of provisions and also the likes of televisions, refrigerators, washing machines, etc., all of which leads to the local economy being rather more buoyant than it probably would otherwise have been (given that it is not that well-suited to being an especially successful as an agricultural region: see quote on p.40). The economic entanglements of the local (sane) people with their 'alien' (insane) lodgers cannot be escaped in any assessment of the local social life of the whole community and district.

A crucial final introductory point concerns what Jodelet herself refers to as the "spatial distribution" or the "ecological distribution" (p.30) of the Family Colony in and around Ainay-le-Château, which embraces a fundamentally 'decentralised' arrangement very different to the agglomerated character of even the most spaced-out asylum or mental hospital. Furthermore, Jodelet considers significant micro-variations between the differing placements for members:

Spread over thirteen *communes*, the placements are very different in appearance. From the detached house, often with two stories and a garden, or the low-level block of flats found in the hamlets or in the towns. (60% of placements), right up to the 'estate', a large agricultural holding of 60 hectares or more farmed by the owner, a tenant or an employee, the estate manager, with buildings organised around a central courtyard (8% of placements), and, between these extremes, the smallholdings whose few hectares are farmed by the owner or rented out and in which the living accommodation and farm buildings are assembled under the same roof (31%). (p.31)

The specific conditions of the lodgers' accommodation varies greatly too, from lodgers in furnished rooms with central heating to lodgers in old converted workshops with little

more than hard-packed earthen floors (see p.31). Crucially, Jodelet considers the 'closeness' of the cohabitation between families and lodgers,¹ itself in part a reflection of a residence's geography (notably whether the lodger is in an outhouse or a room within the family's own living area), and it is obvious that, "[f]rom the very outset, purely spatial and material circumstances regulate the movement of lodgers within a shared living space" (p.33). Detailed 'codes' regarding 'territorial boundaries' seemingly arise within each house to govern these movements, and hence the possibilities for interaction:

Integration defines the permissible level of penetration into the foster parents' domain and the latter employ both concrete and symbolic measures to control the lodger's access to their private territory which lies on the other side of the threshold which they themselves have fixed. Environmental psychology has long since demonstrated the importance of the defence of privacy. We [ie. Jodelet] will have a chance to return to this point when analysing the significance of these spatial dispositions which ... are related to the exercise of a power whose many forms have been described by Foucault (1971, 1977) (p.33)

Jodelet then adds that, "[w]ithin the placements, partitions, protected access, reserved zones all appear as a primary mode of defence", and that "[t]his delimitation and defence of territory is a safeguard against threat which makes peaceful coexistence possible" (p.34). With these words, though, she introduces core themes of her book, which does so centralise the whole question of the small-scale 'spatial dispositions' present at the heart of interactions and relationships between the locality's supposedly sane residents and their supposedly insane cohabitants; small-scale spatial dispositions which, it might be inserted, were closely bound up with the simple 'fact' of Ainay-le-Château and district being in a remote rural part of the world where anonymity is *not* the norm, where face-to-face encounters are the very 'stuff' of everyday social life, and where a lack of anonymity and the unavoidability of such face-to-face encounters dominates all.

Notes on Jodelet's theory and method

There is no need to say too much about Jodelet's disciplinary and theoretical backgrounds, and it would probably be fair to say that numerous passages in the book are devoted to describing, justifying and even eulogising about the value of an academic perspective based in the discipline and conceptual framework of *social psychology*. (At the time of writing of the book, Jodelet was Professor of Social Psychology at the École des Hautes, Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris.) She portrays social psychology as "a discipline which mediates between the psychological and the social, the individual and the collective", observing that "social psychology faces a double challenge: to think of

¹ "There was ... a time in the early days of the Colony when the doctrine of the institution advocated total integration of the lodger into the family, for the good of the patient and in the name of the therapeutic virtues of family life. What is more, this demand was made under favourable circumstances as the first placements, made predominantly amongst poor families, were opened in small homes with the result that the place reserved for the lodger necessarily impinged on the common space" (p.31). However, many families quickly sought to impose some 'distance' between themselves and their lodgers, an important point given Jodelet's overall argument (see below), leading to quite clear separations between the living spaces of the families and of their lodgers (with locked doors, albeit with 'spy-holes', being put between the families and their lodgers) (see pp.31-32). In addition, there was a gradual retreat from an initial requirement that lodgers should always eat *with* their host families: from the time of the First World War, "meals were no longer taken in common and this relaxation became the rule which the [local social] environment imposed on the establishment" (p.45).

the social in terms of the cognitive and the properties of cognition as something social" (p.9). Moreover, Jodelet declares that she is aiming "[t]o apply the standpoint of a psychosociology of knowledge in the approach to the relationship between a community and those members which it considers alien" (p.8), stating that this is an approach which can "embrace ... the processes which bind the life of groups to a social ideation" (p.9). What she means by this statement is the need to adopt a perspective which shows how the thoughts and actions of individuals are embedded within the constructs and expectations of wider communities (of wider society), and she suggests that the solution is to take seriously what she terms - after what S. Moscovici (1961) proposed was required in social psychology - the whole terrain of 'social representations':

We are [hence] following the path traced by Moscovici in his research into the representation of psychoanalysis in which social representations are conceived of as 'theories' which are created and operative at a social level. (p.7)

We ... shall progress on two fronts, on the one hand seeking to pinpoint the conceptions which shape the relationship with the mentally ill, while on the other trying to define how the *context* [my emphasis] in which this relationship is anchored furthers the development of such conceptions. In a word, we shall approach representations as the product, expression and instrument of a group in its relationship with otherness. ... Representations of insanity will help us to understand how the otherness of the mentally ill is conceived, whilst the examination of a concrete *situation of contact* [my emphasis] with the mentally ill will reveal the manner in which these representations are formed and function. (p.8)

Significantly, this perspective is one that takes on board what I would call a 'geographical' sensitivity, since Jodelet acknowledges the importance of the specific worldly contexts or situations within which contacts arise between, say, the sane and the insane. These contexts or situations are reckoned to be far from incidental to the constitution of 'social representations', the spaces and places of everyday social life being entirely integral to the 'making' of the interactions and relations which frame such representations; and, in return, these representations are supposed to feed back into the precise character of the interactions, relations and even the very contexts and situations themselves. In other words, and as should be apparent from the following notes on her book, it strikes me that Jodelet is really working as a 'social geographer' alert to all manner of spaces and places, material and imagined, and supposing - with a nod to Ludwig Wittgenstein - that "explanation is closely bound up with the *local* [my emphasis] system of behaviour and knowledge" (p.20).

There is then a direct link between these theoretical coordinates and the methodology of Jodelet's study as written up in the book being discussed here. She realises the need to start with a focus anchored in specific contexts and situations, and so, "[f]rom the choice of real situations, we have selected a geographically and institutionally circumscribed social framework in which both representation and practice are based on an entire past and present life of proximity to the mentally ill: the Family Colony of Ainay-le-Château" (p.15). She goes on to elaborate that "[t]he diffusion of the mentally ill throughout the social space, their participation in local life, the variety of their contacts with the population enables us to observe, as if through a magnifying glass, the phenomena which emerge in a diffuse and fragmentary way within the framework of our everyday lives" (p.16). (This latter claim, hinting at Jodelet's wish to illuminate the overall achievements (or otherwise) of care in the community for people

with mental health problems, will be developed at various points below.) Turning to the detail of the methods used by her in her study, Jodelet indicates that she is inspired by "the anthropological viewpoint" (p.16), and more specifically by the example of "the community monograph" (p.17), the result being an inquiry resting most pertinently on three strategies:

- (1) *Observation*: sustained "observation through engagement in community life was maintained for the full duration of the investigation, with the aim of discovering the forms of the contact established with the mentally ill in different places and on different occasions: on the public stage (in the streets, at local ceremonies and celebrations); in socially frequented places (shops, cafés, church ...); in private places where people meet the patients and put them to work" (p.18). (My remark about Jodelet being a 'social geographer' should be evident from the claimed attention here to different spaces and places).
- (2) *Questionnaires*: a questionnaire delivered to the 493 placement families and 1,195 patients, administered with the aid of visiting nurses, asking about all manner of details to do with placements, the foster parents and the patients.
- (3) *Interviews*: interviews with a sample of foster parents (65 placements were visited out of 493), looking to achieve some representativeness in terms of certain key axes of variation between placements (in terms of distance from the headquarters of the Colony, type of accommodation, level of comfort, work undertaken, extent of association with family life, sharing of meals, etc.). "[T]he conduct of interviews was inspired by the methods used in the ethnographic study of cultural behaviour" (p.20), and covered memories of patients, stories of social life with patients, and "questions on the everyday conduct of life in the placement and on the causes underlying certain habits and practices" (p.20).

The only further point to notice is that Jodelet's research was actually conducted some time before the first publication of the book in French back in 1988: in fact, she admits that she has "not sought to modernise the description of the world which we encountered nearly twenty years ago" (p.22). As such, the work is not only a work of 'social geography', it is also now something of a work of 'historical geography' as well (something that should be kept in mind when assessing the usefulness of the findings and conclusions for thinking about community care in the countryside at the millennium).

From 'tolerance' to 'impregnation': on socio-spatial exclusions

The basic substantive purpose of this book is to investigate that "transformation in psychiatric policy [which now] swings open the doors of the asylum" (p.1), leading to the (re)appearance in everyday social settings of those people - 'the insane' or even 'the loonies' of older vocabularies - who have for nearly two centuries been systematically removed (socio-spatially separated) from such settings into closed institutional spaces. Jodelet is hence asking about a dramatic shift (using terms borrowed from the anthropologist Levi-Strauss), "without any intermediate stage, from the state of an 'anthropometric' society which spews out the insane, exiling them beyond its frontiers, to that of an 'anthropophagic society' which absorbs them" (p.1). Her argument, at bottom, is that this process, for all of its 'liberal' glosses and for all the talk of society being able to develop a (new) 'tolerance' for these new individuals within its midst, a whole range of much more subtle mechanisms of 'separation' - in effect of 'distancing' (and Jodelet definitely spatialises her claims here) - emerge to maintain a clear distinction between 'us' (the supposedly sane) and 'them' (the supposedly insane). Her work is designed to elaborate what is entailed in "the danger of contact" (p.2) which 'we'

apparently continue to fear in relation to 'them', leading the sane to create fresh, albeit subtle and graduated, boundaries between themselves and their new mentally unwell neighbours in the community. She hence talks, quite simply, about ongoing "unease in the presence of the mentally ill" (p.73). The resulting boundary work on the part of the sane demonstrates that the insane have not suddenly become fully welcomed into wider society, into its everyday communities, but remain on the margins, effectively *non-citizens* debarred from full participation in local social life.

Central to the book is a deconstruction of the notion of 'tolerance', as the seeming antithesis of a previous intolerance built on a fear of danger which led to the consigning of the insane to the walled asylum. A widespread fear of physical danger, of the presumed unpredictable violence of the mad person, had indeed been one motivation behind the socio-spatial exclusion of the insane to locked institutions; and such "danger is [still] the overwhelming argument used to oppose the opening of psychiatric hospitals, as shown by press articles, opinion polls and spontaneous testimonies" (p.74). [And such fears continue to press for the survival of 'asylums' of some form or another ten years later, in 2001.] Jodelet suggests that there was probably something *more* than just a fear of physical danger which energised institutionally-based exclusionary policies, however, and here she draws upon ideas from Michel Foucault's *Madness and Civilization*. Indeed, she proposes, following the much older work of G. Daumézon and L. Bonnafé (1946), that what was happening then, and was is maybe still happening now, "seems like a case of 'primitive social behaviour in the face of mental illness'" (p.74). Putting aside this point for a moment, she explains how a model of 'tolerance' has now become popular, insisting that the physical danger of the insane only really arises in certain contexts, particularly those alienating and *intolerant* environments comprised by asylums or mental hospitals, and that being returned to an everyday 'social environment' - wherein patients can supposedly regain their 'human dignity' - will remove the aggravating causes which otherwise prompt violent behaviour in some mentally unwell people. Thus, the watchword is 'tolerance': generating a new community care policy which, in a very spatial sense, will *replace* the insane in new surroundings where they will experience new waves of tolerance, new feelings of dignity and self-worth, and thereby lose any violent propensities that they might previously have harboured.

Thinking about the conceptual basis of what might be meant by 'tolerance' - the medical notion, for instance, of an organism capable of assimilating a 'foreign body' without rejecting it - Jodelet arrives at a sociological account which acknowledges a certain emptiness at the heart of what 'tolerance' really entails and promises. Drawing on W. Jankélévitch (1970), she concludes that tolerance in this respect can only refer to 'peaceful coexistence'; "and this is what society is expected to show the mentally ill", but it amounts to "no more than the empty form of abstention" (p.75):

It accepts others as they are and not for *what they are* [my emphasis]. ... It supposes a non-communicating juxtaposition within a common social space and, psychologically, almost a social void. It is 'a virtue on which to found a disunited world, a world in which humans ignore each other' [quoting Jankélévitch, 1970]. (p.76)

It is actually to say very little about the actual interactions and relationships that emerge within this 'common social space', beyond suggesting that the differing groups of people present accept each other's presence in a rather apathetic manner. It certainly does not indicate an ethic of welcoming, of care, on the part of a pre-existing human

group in the face of a new group turning up to share that 'common social space'. Launching from this point, Jodelet hence elaborates:

[T]o explain the relationship between the mental patient and society in terms of tolerance alone is to preclude an understanding of the psychosocial dynamic through which strangers, or those who bear the brand of otherness, are received and maintained in a space where nothing necessarily demands their presence. Not that the forms of a silent copresence, deaf or blind to others, cannot be observed. But if people coexist separated by a screen, if in the absence of frontiers [ie, the walls of an asylum], they erect barriers between one another, then we still need to know how and at what price to themselves and their partners. The social environment is a melting pot, not an inert shell. Contacts are formed there, positively or negatively, in accordance with the modalities which are generated by the interplay of the peculiarities, needs, expectations and feelings - experienced or projected - of groups, and which also influence the groups themselves. It is here that we must seek the causes and forms which determine how the mentally ill find their place outside the asylum, the Jews outside the factory, the Africans, Portuguese or other foreigners [ie. 'guestworkers'] outside the factory. (p.76)

This passage perhaps goes to the core of Jodelet's study, then, in that she regards statements about the 'tolerance' of a community such as the one which she studies as vacuous. Instead, she insists that what is required is a much more detailed, grounded inquiry into the intimate 'psychosocial dynamic', the constant interplays with both positive and negative qualities, which runs between different groups (such as the sane and the insane) in the immediate 'social environment' of a given community, time and place. And more than this, because it is obvious from how she words this passage that she does not reckon that boundaries, 'barriers' or 'screens' have disappeared just because the material walls of the asylum have been knocked down. Rather, she reckons that all manner of new, more subtle separations have indeed been introduced which mark a distance between the 'locals' and the 'strangers', those 'who bear the brand of otherness', or, in this case, the insane.

Through the incredibly in-depth empirical research described above, Jodelet strives to show how such subtle separations are forged and then sustained, asking about their deeper psychosocial motivations and also about the broader implications (eg. in terms of how we might judge the overall progress of deinstitutionalisation and care in the community policies for people with mental health problems). Crucially, and as she puts it:

[T]he analysis of the processes which lead to the appropriation of the social space by the patients [the mentally ill members of the community under study], processes which we have ... seen at work in *the control of personal territories* [my emphasis] or in certain social conflicts and behaviour, will reveal the importance of protecting both the social body and the group image and identity [of the supposedly sane members of the community]. (p.77)

Borrowing critically from the literature of social psychology concerned with "prejudices and intergroup relationships", but also from sociologists working "in the field of race relations" (p.77), Jodelet ends up conjecturing that the best way to conceive of what is occurring in her case study - and probably more broadly where people with mental health problems are living 'in' the community - is through the concept of 'impregnation':

The idea of impregnation allows us not just to designate the type of transformation which takes place in the customs and mental habits of those who live in close proximity with mental patients but also to define the mode of action attributed to the latter. ... Moreover, the metaphorical value of the term 'impregnation' also suggests the almost phantasmagorical emotional dimension which characterises the experienced relationship as the immersion of the other in the social body and which lies at the base of all social symbolism which organises the construction of both otherness and the relationship with insanity. (pp.80-81)

These observations begin to capture more of the interpretative case which Jodelet throws over her empirical study, highlighting just how central to her is the *embodied* realm. 'Impregnation' is a very bodily term, speaking of bodies and substances in intimate contact with one another, and obviously being the source of all manner of imageries which can conjure up favourable impressions - being impregnated in the right circumstances by the right person can be a beautiful thing - but which can also resonate with unpalatable sensations of inappropriate, unwanted, repulsive and sickening 'violations' of the self by an-other. And it is these latter sensations, at once signalling an affinity with recent work in human geography by the likes of David Sibley (esp. 1995), which do come to the fore as Jodelet offers an account of her empirical findings.

She develops her thoughts here in various ways, and I will repeat some of her empirical evidence in a moment, but in outline what she argues is that myriad tiny mechanisms arise within the grain of everyday social life to act as "guarantees against the impurity of contact" (p.260): to guard the locality's sane people from undue contact, particularly undue bodily proximity, with their insane lodgers and neighbours. "The avoidance of contact is the establishment of an order which protects the group" (p.261), in that the distancing from individual insane bodies is actually serving the further purpose of cordoning off the overall social body (the sane occupants of this locality) from insane others, with all manner of psychosocial cross-codings running from the bodily level to the social level and back again. (Jodelet's definite psychosocial emphasis, her wish always to be working along the axis shuttling between the individual and the social, is very obvious.) As she writes:

In this network of multiple signifiers which is provided by the acting out of a conception of madness, contact and illness are associated with magic power and pollution on the one hand, and with the otherness and impurity which give rise to social differentiation on the other. This association is only possible given a shift of emphasis away from the illness and towards that which it attacks, from direct contact to social contact, that is to say from the human body to the social body. ... The pollutant power of the illness, a magic force transmitted by contact with living secretions, becomes in the sign of otherness proper to his [*sic*] nature as a bearer of insanity whose impurity threatens the integrity of others. The avoidance of this contact, a measure of hygiene adopted to protect the human body from contamination, becomes a social division established to protect the social body from mixture. (pp.261-262)

Jodelet visualises her claims in this respect with a diagram (her Diagram 2; my Figure 1), which underlines that 'non-contact', or distancing, as a social strategy transmutes the protection of individual bodies from impurity (to prevent contagion, to maintain positive mental health) into the differentiation of 'us' (the sane, in this case) from 'them' (the insane). While it continues to be possible for there to be "the public or semi-public confrontation of everyday coexistence" (p.262), and hence that 'peaceful coexistence' which is the empty husk of 'toleration', there is a deep disturbance to "the intimate

confrontation of physical proximity" (p.262) that drives a wedge between the sane and the insane. And this wedge means that the coexistence in local social spaces can indeed never be of a profound order, can never entail real friendships, lingering time together, the easy sharing of a seat in a park or a meal in a restaurant, the genuinely human contacts which (to generalise) would make care in the community a meaningful accomplishment and not a hollow sham. This is not a wedge that then leads to the mass expulsion of the 'othered' insane from these local social spaces - and in this instance at least there is an economic structure rendering such expulsion impossible, even if some locals might really prefer it - but it is a wedge that marks every moment, every fragment of time and space, in the encounters between the sane and the insane in Ainay-le-Château and district.

Rural stories of madness

Jodelet sketches out the basic population geography of the insane residents living in Ainay-le-Château and its environs, noting that:

... the dispersal of some thousand patients throughout thirteen *communes* creates widely differing conditions of contact. The proportion of patients within the population varies greatly from one *commune* to another, from one corner of the region to the other, varying between 5% and 32% of the local population and, in some cases, even exceeding the number of foster parents in the population. And if, in some villages, the volume of patients is highly impressive, it remains minimal in some of the hamlets and in some places falls to so low a level that the individual patients are practically lost at the bottom of a farm, itself isolated at the end of a road or in the clearing of a forest. What is claimed to be tolerance is, in the rural environment, sometimes only this oblivion in a vast agricultural expanse. (p.57)

One implication is that in some corners of the district - Jodelet prefers to say 'region' - the 'conditions of contact' are more akin to those in rural places elsewhere, as for instance in the remoter Highlands of Scotland, with only very few, maybe just one or two, people with mental health problems being known to the neighbouring families, thus entailing "only a few individuals in brief and episodic encounters" (p.57). Elsewhere around Ainay-le-Château, however, the 'conditions of contact' are very different to those elsewhere, since in many villages:

... everything speaks of their presence: the strange stooped man washing the shop floor who wrings out his floor cloth with the skill of a servant; in the resigned patience of these shoppers waiting their turn to be served at the ironmonger's, the greengrocer's, the chemist's, a turn which will only come when the locals have been dealt with. In other places the unending ballet around the lavatories danced to the constant rumbling sound of the flush contrasts with the discretion of furtive visits to the café and with the placidness of these groups of men who rest together, talking or silent, in the shade of the bus stations or in the sunlit squares. Sometimes, indeed, this presence is the only one to be encountered in the little towns buried in the heart of the countryside, all but deserted when the last of the residents abandon the streets for the fields or kitchen ... (pp.61-62)

The 'encroachment' of the insane on everyday social space is evidently of such a volume that it results in ever-present and ongoing encounters, becoming perhaps the most

significant feature in the social geography of a whole settlement.² Even in these exceptional circumstances, though, there may still be lessons to be learned about how rural communities more generally deal with otherness, particularly if the people involved possess a dimension of 'odd' behaviour. Jodelet traces an enormous range of situated encounters in her country study area, voyaging across all corners of her 'region', and it is possible to pick out four spatial scales of interactions and relations to inspect here.

The streets, lanes and public spaces

Jodelet takes up the 'story' of madness being visible on the streets by contrasting three different fairs in different parts of the Ainay-le-Château district. The first took place "at the very edge of the Colony's territory where placements were seldom opened" (p.57), in a *commune* where only one farm accommodated a lodger. This individual nonetheless attended the *roulade*, a traditional festivity centred on the giving away of hard-boiled eggs to be eaten with a *brioche* and a glass of wine, and Jodelet notes the casual acceptance of him mixed with a basic indifference (contrasting with a more overt teasing of a 'village idiot', presumably someone with a learning difficulty). "In this locality at the edge of the zone of placements, too distant to be visited by lodgers deprived of a means of transport, the only one who had access took his place on an equal footing with the visitors [ie. non-locals]" (p.58), neither shunned or overtly welcomed, experiencing unenthusiastic tolerance as just another person in the crowd, like an unknown visitor in some respects, if not one at all charismatic or deserving of notice. The situation at a second fair was rather different, since here the insane lodgers were much more visible by virtue of their numbers, and Jodelet conveys a picture of fairgrounds containing small enclaves of seating occupied by the lodgers which, she realised, many of the locals sought to avoid:

Some of them took care to maintain a distance between themselves and the lodgers. No one, however, challenged their position. By arriving early, the lodgers had earned their privilege and, knowing with whom they were dealing, the locals considered it better 'not to pay attention'. In this way the patients were able to enjoy a temporary superiority in the tranquil isolation of inattention. (p.58)

This latter phrase, 'the tranquil isolation of inattention', neatly sums up, I think, much that Jodelet is trying to argue about the *real* experience of most lodgers in and around Ainay-le-Château (and, by extension, about the *real* experience of community care). The situation at the third fair, in the village of Ainay, was different again because here there were just so many lodgers, meaning that "the festival of the 14th of July belongs, in some ways, to the insane and the children of Ainay" (p.60), with the consequence that more human traffic occurred between the locals and the insane. Yet, even here "a great mass of lodgers gather[ed] at a slight distance from the square" (p.60), sticking

² Actually, Jodelet goes on to argue as follows, in part acknowledging the mobility of the insane, their willingness to walk long distances partly as a result of their limited access to public transport but maybe reflecting some 'inherent' restlessness and will to roam: "... whatever their density, the lodgers appear in everyday life as if embedded in the natural and social landscapes. The freedom they enjoy leads them to disperse amongst the villages or to ramble through the countryside. Nearly half of them prefer to live away from their place of residence or are more or less forced to do so on account of their foster parents, especially in the towns [see below]. In this way, even in places where they appear in no significant numbers, they remain a diffuse, insinuating presence, signs of which can be found everywhere: in the tireless walker who has marched many kilometres into the heart of the country; in the shuffling silhouette pushing its trolley along the road or letting a pair of boots dangle from the end of its arms; in the perpetual dreamer lost in reverie on an embankment or sitting on a bench; at the approach to the village ..." (p.61).

together and remaining quite immobile for the whole event, while there was always a "vigilant gaze surveying the scene" (p.59) as the locals, specifically parents, checked to see that the lodgers were complying with "the established order of the ceremony" (p.60). Jodelet also seems to be suggesting that this was an event when the locals knew and accepted that the lodgers would be a prominent presence, and that some contact (and control) would be necessary; the encounter was hence being conducted on their terms, with their provisos, and the extent of true integration was maybe less than might initially have appeared to be the case.

As indicated several times earlier, on a daily basis the insane lodgers were always to be found on the streets, in the small knots of men sitting quietly by the bus station or in the town square, and in the many wanderers along the lanes of the district: "in the tireless walker who has marched many kilometres into the heart of the country; in the shuffling silhouette pushing its trolley along the road" (p.60). Jodelet evidently reckons that their ubiquity in public spaces actually lends a certain character to these spaces, given that their ways, sad looks, nervous demeanours, soft tones are what 'people' the streets of these small towns and villages (far more than do the ordinary locals about their business). Interestingly, in this connection she discusses the so-called 'anticolonist struggle', referencing those locals who are hostile to the widespread presence of the insane on the streets of the district, and she repeats a few remarks from interviewees: "And they [the anticolonists] think it's not a very pretty sight to see them [the insane] wandering around in the streets, people like that" (quoted on p.63); "... a few families have created some disagreement in the *commune* by saying that it's not the right thing for a town, because they are worried about the appearance of their town" (quoted on p.63); " People opposed it because they didn't want others to see the patients wandering about the town. They said that the example of one or two might lead them to ..." (quoted on p.64); "The ones [the insane] who are in the town and don't have anything to do, they're always in the square, lying, sprawling. Well, of course it's annoying to the population!" (quoted on p.64). These remarks reveal concerns about the aesthetics of having the insane on the streets - everyone agreeing that there are certain bodily characteristics, of comportment, gait, look, clothes, etc., which mark out who is insane from who is not - perhaps because it might deter tourists, but probably more because of a fear that *all* of the district's residents might become thought of as mad. If the insane are allowed on the streets, usually an indication for someone that they have "full civic status" (p.64) in a given place, then passers-through might be led to believe that insanity is here the norm, the attribute of all regular citizens, thus leading the affliction of mental illness to have (symbolically) 'infected' or 'impregnated' the whole social body. (And immediately note the links back to the more theoretical aspects of Jodelet's study summarised above.)³ What this all implies is that, while the insane are a highly visible and tolerated public presence in Ainay-le-Château and surrounding rural tracts, this does not lead them to be straightforwardly included (welcomed) into everyday social life: their very proliferation on the streets where 'normal' people of the locality are apparently much *less* likely to be found 'hanging out' maybe amounts,

³ Actually, the locals work with a definite if not all that conceptually clear (as in reasoned) distinction between themselves as 'civilians' and their insane lodgers as 'non-civilians' (see pp.88-90), implying some link to "group prohibitions" - there are certain 'things' that have to be 'right' before you become a 'civilian' - but also a fuzzy link to "judicial" (p.88) understandings such as those to with the legally-enshrined rights and responsibilities of 'citizenship'. The extent to which the insane lodgers of Ainay-le-Château and district are properly 'citizens', despite being allowed to occupy public space in a manner seemingly reserved for true 'citizens', is actually one warranting further attention from the viewpoint of a political geography of citizenship (see Painter and Philo, 1995).

ironically enough, to a form of socio-spatial isolation; while their bodily presence on the streets does cause much unease because of certain aesthetic worries, a resentment of 'idleness' and a fear about an ensuing (symbolic) contamination of the sane community.

The cafés, the churches and other semi-public spaces

Immediately after describing the relatively inclusionary aspects of the festival at Ainay, Jodelet adds the following:

There are other public occasions when the population of Ainay is less prompt to lower its defences. At the dance a lodger is allowed to watch but not to take part. When films are shown at the local hall, the darkness proves to be a cause for reticence and the patients are consigned to a corner whose seating is separated from that of the public. In church, where once they were grouped together in a special area close to the side door, they are now perfectly free to sit wherever they please. Although the priest, once attacked as a 'revolutionary' for opposing these segregatory measures, has been unable to gain them access to seats traditionally reserved for certain families, some of them are, at least, allowed to approach the altar. (p.61)

In these semi-public spaces of the dance, the film and church-going, there remains an apparent urge to retain a measure of socio-spatial exclusion of the insane, even if being effected very much at the micro-scale of particular zones, set-aside seating, within the overall physical space of shared social happenings.

It is with a more in-depth assessment of what she terms 'demarkation', in a chapter entitled 'From difference to separation', that Jodelet begins to prepare the ground for her more theoretical claims about socio-spatial exclusion and its deep psychosocial roots. The separate queues in local shops - one for locals which is always dealt with first, and one for lodgers - is a small emblem of what is occurring in this respect (see p.86), and so too is the logic of the 'three cafés' in the small town of Ainay-le-Château:

The largest, a *brasserie*, is frequented by workers and, during the school holidays, by the local youth. The coming and going of the customers follows an inflexible rhythm. A few lodgers venture into the café during the empty hours of the afternoon but make way, before six o'clock has struck, for the workers stopping for a drink on their way home. In the summer, the lodgers retire in the face of large numbers of young people. The inside room of another café opens onto the road through a wide door. At all hours of the day this room gives shelter to farmers, salesmen, managers and foremen who meet to discuss business or just to have a quick chat. Only one or two of the working lodgers, acquaintances of the landlord, drop in briefly to quench their thirst at the bar. The others feel *out of place* [my emphasis]. They prefer to go to the hotel-restaurant, a small establishment consisting of two buildings. The first, situated at the end of the courtyard, is the restaurant with its small, attractive American bar. This is separated by the hotel entrance and two doors from the front room whose view over the road is entirely shut out by a thick curtain. Each section of this establishment is reserved. The restaurant belongs to the hotel guests, the upholstered bar to the good-time seekers and certain 'ladies', and the front room with its long tables and its white rough-hewn benches along the bare walls is reserved for the lodgers. Nobody else frequents this room, hidden from view, where sad silhouettes silently consume their half bottles of wine. However, it is enough for it to adjoin the little bar to deprive the latter of its local custom. (pp.86-87)

This stunning piece of detailed ethnographic observation sharpens dramatically the impression of socio-spatial divisions between supposedly sane locals and labelled insane lodgers, and Jodelet reflects that "[t]hese spontaneous demarcations are the most obvious signs of an order which specifies the place of the lodgers in the community" (p.87). (And note the double meaning of 'place' here, referring to both actual material spaces and metaphorically to a position in a local hierarchy of social status and acceptance.) One of the few patients interviewed by Jodelet confirms that such a dual 'placing' occurs, recalling how he was ordered on one occasion to "[j]oin your companions at the back of the church on the benches without backs", and stating that, after all, "there's no total integration" (quoted on p.87).

Accommodation and private spaces

The ideal on which the Family Colony was founded told of insane patients being fully integrated into the living spaces, and hence into the everyday routines, of their foster parents (see Footnote 1), but it seems that this quickly became an intimate socio-spatial inclusion rarely followed in all but a few instances. Much of Jodelet's analysis hinges around the detailed separations, the often unspoken codes and rules governing these separations, enacted within the living spaces and immediate domestic surroundings (eg, in the courtyards, gardens, vegetable plots, etc.) of foster parents taking in insane lodgers. A common practice emerged which entailed lodgers being put in outhouses, sometimes quite distant from the family accommodation, or being kept for much of the day behind a locked door: ie. there was a partition between 'our' living space and 'their' living space which might include a locked door.⁴ One resident confessed that:

I've got three of them behind that door. Look, right near by. And my neighbours aren't far away. I say to myself: I'm all surrounded by seven but I'm not afraid of them. My neighbour, on the other hand, she's frightened of having them in her courtyard. That's why she has her room so far away. (quoted on p.32)

The reality of distancing, partitioning and an evident anxiety about such spatial proximity to the insane comes over repeatedly in Jodelet's account (and some features of her account in this connection have already been introduced at the end of the opening section above).

She found some instances of close contact, allowing an everyday intimacy within home spaces: "My mother had one. It was as if he was part of the family. ... He had his chair in the kitchen, as if he was one of the family" (quoted on p.105); "They live with us, eat with us. We think of them as family. Fourteen of us sit down to eat. My patients are like part of the rest of us" (quoted on p.105). "But", continues Jodelet, "these instances of close contact are very much the exception" (p.105), and it is rare to find lodgers treated as family, with a revealing statistic - particularly given Jodelet's arguments about the potential contamination of the insane body - is that "a strict separation of meals is the rule in 82% of placements" (p.105). Sharing of Sunday outings and watching the television is similarly rare, so Jodelet finds, all of which "points to the

⁴ In the early days, this led to some incidents occurring which were down to a *lack* of supervision. "The result was that the officials of the Colony were obliged to rule that at least one window, the 'spy-hole', should be installed between the foster parents' room and that of the lodgers to ensure that communication with the latter should always be possible. Even today, it is still possible in some placements to find a glass door joining the family room to the lodgers' room, covered on the family's side by a net curtain which can be lifted to observe what is happening on the other side" (p.32).

workings of a social process of distancing" (p.105) which she refers to here, in the context of private spaces, as a state for the insane lodgers of being "in the house, not of the house" (subheading on p.104). Further remarks from foster parents serve to illustrate what is the more common condition in the district: "They live there in their room, they eat in their room, there aren't many who let the lodgers eat with them, nobody. Nobody does" (quoted on p.108); "From the start they have had their room and I've had my house. I let them come here if they have to, either to bring something or to fetch something. Otherwise I never, never let them come here. Not even to watch the telly. Otherwise I wouldn't feel at home" (quoted on p.108). The latter quote is telling in that it demonstrates that the woman speaking feels that her house and home, this socio-spatial bastion of her own identity and well-being, would be violated if her lodgers were to spend any social time within its four walls.⁵ There is obviously a process whereby lodgers are educated in the micro-territorial requirements of the private spaces of a placement, "because the delimitation of living spaces and the organisation of daily contact establishes a differential way of life which obeys the rule of separation" (p.125):

I get them used to it. They have their room. They walk through the courtyard. You have to get them used to it. If they want something they come to the door to ask for it, 'Please Madame'. *They are used to it, they're not ashamed* [original emphasis]. When the last one arrived, he came into the house straightaway. I said to him, '*You're not allowed to do that*' [original emphasis]. If you want something, ask for it'. Now that's all over. If he needs something, he asks me for it. He never dreams of coming into the house. (p.127)

In some placements, a small 50cm high barrier, previously a device for keeping poultry out of the kitchen, is a symbolic marker of this separation whereby lodgers are not allowed into the house (ie. into the foster family's own living quarters). Another interviewee declared that "[y]ou have to be able to put them in their place" (quoted on p.127), perhaps indexing the double sense of 'placement' (material and hierarchical) mentioned earlier, while a third interviewee indicated that "you have to keep a certain authority over them, a certain distance" (quoted on p.128), where the 'distance' reference probably carries a similar double sense. Jodelet considers occasions where lodgers have become too 'bold', a notion that she explores at some length, noting that they might end up seeking to "claim unacceptable rights such as the demand for excessive attention or unauthorised entry into the house" (p.132), and she goes on to state that "[t]he rule of distance becomes a prohibition, boldness a transgression" (p.134). When transgression-as-boldness occurs, often it arises together with breaking of intimate socio-spatial boundaries: a specific example, one building in faint suggestions of sexual inappropriateness, being a lodger taking to stealing a neighbour's washing from her yard (see p.134); and another example, one building in the issue of 'dirtiness' and hence echoes of pollution and impurity, being a lodger "who pees upstairs and always in the same place" (quoted on p.144), including on people's washing. Such transgressions, together with their additional symbolic codings, unsurprisingly promote all kinds of psychosocial stress for the foster parents involved and, arguably, for the immediate community as well; and, as a result, a "defensive conflict [is] engendered by coexistence with the lodgers when privacy is shared, the home invaded and the barriers of propriety broken down" (p.134). It is therefore in everyday 'defence' against this shattering of

⁵ The reverse possibility is raised in one case, where a lodger did not like his foster parents entering what he regarded as *his* private space: "He didn't like me entering his room, it was sacred to him" (quoted on p.129).

the practical and symbolic order, which threatens to diffuse out into the wider community as well as ruining the normal equilibrium of home life, that the sane foster parents tend to install a strict socio-spatial partitioning of private spaces: a micro-scale divisioning which, if we examine closely, does begin to question the reality of the 'co' in 'coexistence'.

Cutlery, washing and bodily spaces

With the nods immediately above about issues to do with sex and dirt, we move into the most 'close-in' elements of the geographies that Jodelet effectively reviews in her study. Three claims from her interviewees, collected together at the start of one chapter towards the close of the book, convey an empirical flavour of what is involved here:

My grandmother kept her cutlery and crockery marked her whole life long. The old people, they used to think of it more as an incurable illness, something you could catch. (quoted on p.231)

When I do the washing I keep the patients' separate from the rest. The washing-up as well, because having children here we started like that at the beginning. Even if they're very, very clean because, after all, deep down they are human beings like us, but all the same (quoted on p.231)

There's nothing to be frightened of in the illness, it's not contagious. But, still, a lot of the lodgers would quite happily kiss a child and I don't like to see that. (quoted on p.231)

It is in this regard that Jodelet's theoretical claims about the bodily basis of socio-spatial exclusions, as mentioned earlier, become most relevant. Indeed, she is able to identify countless micro-situations where sane foster parents pursue all kinds of 'contortions' in their management of household items, notably cutlery, washed clothes and washing-up in the sink, to achieve what is in effect a highly embodied distancing of their families from their insane lodgers. In short, items to be touched, handled, licked and worn by lodgers are to be kept clearly distinguished from those which family members will be utilising in a similarly intimate manner.

The irony here is that, although some older residents of the district might really believe in the physical contagion of mental illness from one body to the next, entirely irrational fears about bodily contact - or, more specifically, about what might occur if the bodies of the sane are 'impregnated' by the blood, saliva, perspiration and other secretions of the insane - continue to linger in the psychosocial make-up of many foster parents. Jodelet insists too that these fears cannot be localised in a handful of specially 'phobic' foster parents, but rather emanate from a widely-held if fairly unspoken understanding of madness, a deep-seated representation of madness, common throughout the locality (see pp.239-240). The supposed "special smell" (quoted on p.238) of the insane, thought to be associated with either their sweat or their smoking and general lack of hygiene, is often mentioned as a form of justification for this bodily repulsion, but there are clearly many other bodily properties which come into play here. In fact, she conducts a nuanced inquiry into 'the separation of the waters' in both the cleaning of clothes and the scrubbing of plates, noting differing and apparently contradictory practices between and within the same households, and eventually she

formulates an interpretation which proposes the pertinent understanding here to be not so much *medical as magical*:

The contagion which is denied [by most locals] is medical in nature, that which is feared is a magical contagion. At one and the same time we can say that the lodger is not a carrier of germs or microbes, that his [*sic*] illness is not infectious or contagious in the sense that, for example, tuberculosis is, that the visits from the medical staff eliminate any risk of morbid disease, and yet continue to assert that contamination is provoked by phenomena which do not fall within the medical sphere. ... [W]e see the emergence of a notion inspired by a process similar to that underlying the idea of imitative magic according to which imitating something leads to its creation. In the organism - animal or human - can have a beneficial or harmful effect on the body is to appeal to a power with which certain objects or certain beings are endowed, and at the same time to appeal to a magical conception of contagion which is based on the principle that two things which are united and then separated remain in contact, the power of one remaining within the other. (p.251)

Jodelet acknowledges that some might be sceptical about "[t]his appeal to a magical mode of thought" (p.251), but she is convinced - on the basis of very detailed research - that a local folk-belief, if unarticulated and maybe impossible of full articulation, is that "[m]ental illness becomes consubstantial with the patient, inherent in his [*sic*] nature, and leaves its imprint on everything he is and everything he produces" (p.252). Thus, the dirt, pollution and impurity of the insane - the potential for the poor mental state of the insane to transfer to sane people who come into contact with their bodily products - is all about a 'magical' connection, not one conceived of at all medically or scientifically, buried influentially but deeply within a local netherworld of imagination, superstition and scant-remembered ancient lore.

Probably bound into all of this is a fear of impregnation which has sexual connotations too, also associated with the corruption of innocence, which is where particular worries surface about insane lodgers being around children; and all of these ingredients, crazily spun together, are expressed in these words from an interviewee:

They [the lodgers] do their dishes themselves. As for their washing, I do it in the washing machine, of course, but I don't wash it with mine. Because they have a smell which you don't. It isn't that I'm afraid of infection, not at all, because their illness isn't contagious. If there's something wrong with the lungs, tuberculosis or something like that, it's very soon found out because they go for radiography once a year. It's not that I'm frightened of it. But no ... it wouldn't be proper to leave the children with the lodgers. Especially, I don't know if you follow me, especially with the little girls. There are some who have been caught unawares. (quoted on p.263)

The preservation of a micro-spatial order in the private spaces of family placements, one designed both to keep distinct items upon which bodily secretions might cling or into which they might infuse, is hence wrapped up with attempts to keep children - especially young girls - partitioned off from the presence of insane lodgers (see also pp.266-270).⁶

⁶ Interestingly, Jodelet identifies a 'taboo' against local women having sexual relations, let alone marrying, lodgers: "we met a woman who was ignored in her village for living with a lodger. Her presence was still tolerated because she had not actually married him. But if the pair marries they have to leave the region. ... The inadmissible thing about marriage is that it makes the lodger a fully fledged member of the community. The unthinkable hybrid is not so much the child of the patient but the loony who has become a civilian" (pp.270-271).

Jodelet duly casts the latter in the terms of "[r]efused object, sexual prohibition" (p.264), at which point the centrality of women - the wives, mothers and principal carers in the family placements - may itself not be an insignificant consideration (suggesting that the micro-spatial order under scrutiny is very much a female construction, rooted in local 'feminine' mythologies and policing: see p.264). Furthermore, she speculates that, "[a]s the representatives and protectors of a family and a social order of which they are the weak [vulnerable? frontline?] link, the women can only perpetuate this order by erecting hierarchical barriers and symbolic prohibitions which preserve them [and their daughters] from contact with that by which the order is threatened" (p.271). And, just to reiterate, integral to this order is the conjoint manipulation of private and bodily spaces, reinforcing, should it need reinforcing, the realisation that the rural story here is one of 'coexistence' encompassing two very separate, splintered, 'existences'.

References

- Daumézon, G. and Bonnafé, L., 1946, "Le malade mentale dans la société", in *Documents de l'information psychiatrique*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer
- Douglas, M.,
- Foucault, M.,
- Foucault, M.,
- Jankélévitch, W., 1970, *Traité des vertus, 2: Le vertus et l'amour*, Paris: Bordas
- Jodelet, Denise (1991, trans.) [1989] *Madness and Social Representations*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York
- Painter, J. and Philo, C., 1995, "Spaces of citizenship: an introduction", *Political Geography Quarterly*, Vol.XXX. pp.XX-XX